The Sunday Problem

Its Present Day Aspect

SUNDAY STREET-CAR TRAFFIC

A Reply

to John S. Ewart, Esq., K.C.

BY

Rev. J. J. Roy, B.A.
Winnipeg

WINNIPEG:
The Manitoba Free Press Company
1902

KF
2009
R68

B3835

The Sunday Street-Car Traffic

By Rev. J. J. Roy, B.A.

A formidable document is Mr. Ewart's address of last Sunday. A wonderful array of texts and Scripture quotations. It covers no less than three full pages of the Free Press, and in good solid, visible type. A marvellous display of erudition. Mr. Ewart sees no valid religious objections to the Sunday street car traffic. Why, far from seeing any valid religious objection, he finds no religious objection whatever to the traffic. No wonder, because in his extraordinary dialectical powers, he begins by sweeping away, any such thing as a religious objection, and then concludes that there is no valid religious objection.

The Bible Torn to Pieces.

To reach his conclusion, he begins by literally tearing the Bible to pieces, and here he calls to his aid the "Higher Critics," and amongst others George Adam Smith and his book "Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament," the Yale lectures for 1901. Listen to Mr. Ewart expounding the intricacies of the problems of the higher critics.

Mr. Ewart as An Exegete.

Says Mr. Ewart, "Higher Criticism ignores Inspiration. The Pentateuch is a conglomeration of the writings of several persons, none of whom we know, but it is not difficult to detect contributions from four principal writers. . . . . These four principal writers are known as the Jahvistic, the Elohistic, the Priestly and the Deuteronomist, all of whom lived after the time of Solomon. The editors are absolutely unknown . The Pentateuch is full of legend a. nyth and imperfection and contradiction."

So ipse dixit Mr. Ewart "Higher Critic" clean cut, everything clear and simple, manuscript in hand, all arranged : The Mappiqand Raphe ; the Maqueph and Metheg ; the Qeri and Kethibh ; the Piel and Pual ; the Hifhil and Hophal; the Pe Guttural, the Ayin Guttural and the Lamedh Guttural so Mr. Ewart "Higher Critic."—Manuscript in hand has it all arranged, ipse dixit, George Adam Smith, "No inspiration, but legends, myth, imperfection, contradiction."

After this, can there be any religious objection left in the whole wide world? Surely not. There cannot be any valid religious objection to the Sunday street car traffic. There you have it all in a nut shell, pure logic—and there it comes, that in order to justify the Sunday street car traffic, you must first begin by the tearing the Bible to pieces. You cannot have them as long as the Bible stands. S get rid of it by hook or by crook.

Canon Driver vs. Mr. Ewart.

Mr. Ewart, we all know, is a great scholar; but still it may be interesting to compare his conclusions, with some of the "Higher Critics," Canon Driver, for instance, the Regius Professor of Hebrew, at Oxford, associated with Dr. C. A. Briggs, in the publication of the International Theologi-

cal library and universally acknowledged to be one of the foremost "Higher Critics." Well, now, Canon Driver's reputation as an expert in this field cannot be questioned. And so I will give you his opinions, as we find them in his "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament" (Scribner's, 1899)—Says Canon Driver, "That P. and J. E. (this is the name given to the original documents) form two clearly, definable, independent sources, is a conclusion abundantly justified by the facts. As regards the analysis of J. E. the criteria are fewer and less definite and the points of demarcation cannot in all cases be determined with the same confidence. . . . . Dillman attempts to separate J. and E. with great minuteness. But it is questionable if the phraseological criteria upon which he mainly relies, warrant the conclusion which he draws from them. He is apt not to allow sufficiently for the probability that the two writers whose general styles were such as those of J. and E. are known to have been, would make use of the same expressions, where these expressions are not (as in the case of P.) of a peculiar, strongly marked type, but are such as might be used, so far as we can judge, by any writer of the best historigraphical style. (Introduction p. 19.)

So then, owing to the nature of the problem, the inextricable difficulties involved, you see the reserve, the moderation, the suspense of judgment of the expert and competent scholar and you can compare it with the unbounded assurance and confidence of Mr. Ewart. It is remarkable how, when one rejects the true faith, one is apt to believe the incredible and the ludicrous. The credulity of unbelief is a curious phenomenon.

Creed Inspiration and Revelation.

It is not enough to indicate the nature of the problem; the conclusion arrived at by "Higher Criticism" must be considered. Because according to Mr. Ewart, orthodoxy—and no body else, can believe in Inspiration and the authority of the Scriptures. Again, I appeal to Canon Driver—and let us be clear about the point under discussion. And for the purpose, I will refer again to the documentary origin of the Pentateuch, and then you may judge whether it rejects the Inspiration and the authority of the Bible or not.

That the Priest's Code formed a clearly defined document, distinct from the rest of the Hexateuch, appears to me to be more than sufficiently established by a multitude of convergent indications, and I have nowhere signified any doubt on this conclusion. On the other hand, in the remainder of the narrative of Genesis to Numbers and of Joshua, though there are facts which satisfy me that this is also not homogeneous, I believe that the analysis (from the nature of the criteria on which it depends) is frequently uncertain, and will perhaps always continue so. . . . "The same conclusion is constantly made by Wellhausen, Kuenen and other critics."—(Preface, p. v.)

"It is not the case that critical conclusions such as those expressed in the volume are in conflict either with the Christian creeds or with the articles of the Christian faith. Those conclusions affect not the fact of revelation but only its form. They help to determine the stage through which it passed, the different phases which it assumed, and the process by which the record of it was built up. They do not touch either the authority or the inspiration of the Scriptures of the Old Testament. They imply no change in respect to the Divine attributes revealed in the Old Testament; no change in the lessons of human duty to be derived from it; no change as to the general position (apart from the interpretation of particular passages that the Old Testament points prophetically to Christ."

(Preface, p. IX.)

"None of the historians of the Bible claim supernatural enlightment for the materials of their narrative. (See Luke I, 1-4: it is reasonable therefore to conclude that those were derived by them from such human sources as were at the disposal of each particular writer, in some cases from a writer's own personal knowledge, in others from earlier documentary sources; in others, especially in those relating to a distant past, from popular tradition. It was the function of Inspiration to guide the individual writer in the choice and disposition of his material, and in his use of it, for the inculcation of special lessons. And in the production of some parts of the Old Testament different hands co-operated and have left traces of their work more or less discernible. The whole is subordinated to the controlling agency of the Spirit of God causing the Scriptures of the Old Testament to be profitable "for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness." (Preface p. x.)

Criticism in the hands of Christian scholars does not banish or destroy the Inspiration of the Old Testament;

it presupposes. It seeks only to determine the conditions under which it operates, and the literary forms through which it manifests itself; and it thus helps us to free our conceptions of the methods which it has pleased God to employ in revealing Himself to His ancient people of Israel, and in preparing the way for the fuller manifestation of Himself in Christ Jesus.—(Preface, p. xiii.)

"And to mention but three representative names from among ourselves, Prof. Kirkpatrick, Prof Sanday and, most recently, Mr. R. S. Ottley, Bampton Lecturer for 1897, all men of cautious and well balanced judgment, have signified with the reservations which, considering the nature of the subject matter, are only reasonable, but at the same time unambiguously their acceptance of the critical position. Mr. Ottley, in particular, has demonstrated what many had before been conscious of, but had not developed upon the same comprehensive scale, the entire compatibility of a critical position with the truest and warmest spiritual perception and with the fullest loyalty to the Christian creed."—(Preface, p. xxii.)

"The committee appointed to report upon the subject (of Higher Criticism) by the conference of bishops of the Anglican Communion, held at Lambeth in July 1897, while naturally passing no verdict itself upon critical questions, affirms distinctly both the right and the duty "of the critical study of every part of the Bible on the part of those Christian teachers and theologians who are capable of undertaking it," and anticipate no disparagement of scripture, but rather "an increased and more vivid sense of Divine revelation" contained in it, from the careful reverent application to it of critical methods.—(Preface, p. xvii.")

According then to Canon Driver, one may accept the documentary origin of the Pentateuch and still continue to believe in its Inspiration and Divine authority. As far as this "Higher Critics" goes anyho. we have still the 4th commandment as coming from God.

Oh, Mr. Ewart says, Canon Driver is not my friend, it is George Adam Smith whom I have recommended. So Mr. Ewart has appealed to the court of George Adam Smith well to the court of George Adam Smith let him go; let him go to the very book mentioned, "Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament." Here it is, page viii of the Preface:

"The objects of these Lectures are, in the main, three: A statement of the Christian right of criticism; an account of the modern critical movement so far as the Old Testament is concerned, and an appreciation of its effects upon the Old Testament as history and as record of a Divine Revelation."—Preface, p. viii.)

Again in Lecture IV, p. 110:

"We have now reached the most important part of the questions with which these Lectures have to deal—does the criticism—whose historical results are estimated in last Lecture—leave to us unimpaired our belief in the Old Testament as the record of a Divine Revelation?"

Further—Lecture IV, p. 116:

"I think it can be shown that criticism, so far from throwing doubts either upon the uniqueness of Israel's true knowledge of God, or upon the personal influence of God as producing this, certainly proves the former and leaves us with the latter as its most natural and scientific explanation."

Divine Revelation on a Surer Basis.

"Or to put this otherwise—the most advanced modern criticism provides grounds for the proof of a Divine revelation in the Old Testament at least more firm than those on which the older apologetic used to reply."

And still more—Lecture IV, note p. 115:

"It would be very easy to prove the compatability of belief in Revelation of the Old Testament with the results of modern criticism by simply citing the personal dicta of some of the most eminent critics. Professor Budde, a pupil of Kuenen and one of the most eminent German critics, wrote me that as for himself, his belief in "a genuine Revelation of God in the Old Testament remains rock-fast." This belief has been shared and stated by a number of advanced critics."

I leave it now to you to judge of Mr. Ewart's statements about the results of "Higher Criticism," the Inspiration, and Revelation of the Bible, and the "legend, myth, imperfection and contradicion of the Pentateuch." George Adam Smith would repudiate with scorn the views ascribed to him. In the name of justice, and English fair play, I would ask Mr. Ewart to read George Adam Smith again to withdraw his statement and write at once and make an apology to the learned professor of Old Testament Language and Literature of the United Free Church of Scotland, Glasgow College, for thus misrepresenting this

leading representative of "Higher Criticism."

The Fourth Commandment From God.

Here I part with the "Higher Critics" and come to the "Fourth Commandment."

Mr. Ewart said: "The Fourth Commandment is not binding on us; because God did not issue it."

Now, I would ask him a few questions: If God did not issue the Fourth Commandment, can he tell me who did issue it? Can he find it anywhere else than in God's Book? Can he discover it before the coming of Christ anywhere else than among God's people? If he can, I would beg him to let me have the name of the man who did issue it, the name of the book that contains it; and the name of the people who had it. Till he tells me this, I will continue, millions and millions of people will continue, and the voters upon the Sunday street car by-law will continue to believe that God did issue it. They will say with Arthur Hallam: "I know that the Bible is God's Book, because it is man's Book; because it fits into every turn and fold of the human nature." We may say in regard to God's Day: "The highest proof of its divinity is its humanity."

There is not a single moral precept in the Decalogue, the authority of which is everywhere acknowledged, that has not its counterpart in a natural law behind it, which lies at the very root and foundation of the nature of man and society, of which the written command is the formulated utterance.

So just as back of the written law which commands obedience to parents, or that which forbids murder, or adultery or stealing, men have learned to acknowledge a previously existing natural law; so behind this command of a Weekly Rest Day would we expect to discover, and we do discover, a natural law of periodic rest—just as the other great natural laws—that of the family, of life, purity, property—have each their counterpart in the written word, we expect to find also this law of the Sabbath in God's Word. Hence, then, the origin and authority of the Weekly Rest Day, is a law of nature, that is a law of God, and as such it was written by the finger of God on a table of stone, permanent and eternal, solid as the rock, and written by the pen of Moses in God's Book, and forms the Fourth Commandment of the Decalogue.

To quote Mr. Ewart's own words: "The naturalistic view is based upon the necessities of human life. * * * There is no disagreement then as to this naturalistic view." According to this admission, the Fourth Commandment is founded on the natural law of the Weekly Rest Day. But if God has made man, such that he needs (and who will deny that he needs it, surely not Mr. Ewart!) the Weekly Rest Day; it is God's will, surely, that man observe that rest. Does not the clearly, experimentally, universally ascertained will of God constitute Divine law? Then the Fourth Commandment of the Decalogue is Divine law, that is, God did issue it.—Q. E. D.

Fourth Commandment Still Binding.

"But," continues Mr. Ewart, "If God did issue it (so you see it is merely dialectics with him, there is no moral certainty), then it is not binding, because it was intended for the Jews only." Well, intended for the Jews only! Mr. Ewart from henceforth must take no weekly rest—plead at court seven days in the week.

Now, the Decalogue does not bind us merely because given by Moses from God, but because it is given us as a code of moral laws, which in their very nature as moral, bind all men in all ages and in all lands.

The words of Christ that, "The Sabbath was made for man." For man, for the man as such, i. e., for all men in all ages, in all lands, show that it was intended to be binding on us all.

At the time of the Reformation there were differences of opinion about the Sabbath, but it is generally admitted that the leading facts the Reformation history in the question at issue is this:

1. In general, that the Decalogue is a code of moral laws, binding all men in all ages and in all lands.

2. In particular, that the Fourth Commandment is a moral law of permanent and universal obligation.

Is not the Fourth Commandment, I would ask Mr. Ewart, as perpetual and universal as human nature? It aims to prevent vagrancy by requiring men to work six days in the week. Is it only the Jews that are vagrants? It aims to secure every seventh day for the rest of body and mind. Is Mr. Ewart a Jew, and is he the only one that needs rest? It aims to culture the soul into righteousness, morality, holiness. Do none but Jews need that? Hath none but a Jew muscles, home, mind and soul? One would think that, if the Weekly Rest Day were for the Jew alone!

The fact of the matter is that the Sabbath is not Jewish, but human and humane. It dates from the creation as well as marriage. The Sabbath as well as marriage dates from creation,

and though marriage is made a sign of God's fellowship with the church, it is primarily a law for the preservation of physical and moral health, and so with the Sabbath, though it is incidentally used as a symbol of creation and other Divine acts, it is primarily a law of health and holiness. Now, health and holiness are universal and eternal needs. So the law of the Fourth Commandment must be universal, eternal and binding on all men as long as the world exists in its present conditions.

This is the teaching of the Old Testament. The permanent and universal obligation of the Fourth Commandment is the teaching of Divine Revelation, of the Old Testament itself.

Permanent Obligation of Fourth Commandment Taught in the Bible.

Listen to these words (Isaiah lvi. 1-7):

"Thus saith the Lord, keep ye judgment and do justice: for My salvation is near to come and My righteousness to be revealed. Blessed is the man that doeth this and the Son of Man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth from polluting it; and keepeth his hand from doing any evil. Neither let the son of the stranger, that hath joined himself to the Lord, speak, saying: The Lord hath utterly separated me from His people; neither let the eunuch say, Behold, I am a dry tree. For thus saith the Lord unto the eunuch that keep My Sabbaths and choose the things that please Me, and take hold of My covenant; even unto them will I give in My house and within my walls a name and a place better than of sons and of daughters: I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off. Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve Him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be His servants.

Every One That Keepeth the Sabbath From Polluting It

and taketh hold of My covenant; even them will I bring to My holy mountain and make them joyful in the house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon My altar: for my house shall be called an

House of Prayer for All People."

With teaching of this kind who will believe that the law of the Sabbath was merely for a Jew and not for every man? And how utterly false the assertion of Mr. Ewart, that the old covenant was merely tribal, and intended to remain such. How inconsistent with the facts. History is a matter of facts and not dialectic drawn from a priori false premises.

Sabbath Outside of the Pentateuch.

Mr. Ewart throws the Pentateuch overboard to get rid of the authority of the fourth commandment of the Decalogue. But the Pentateuch is not the whole Bible, and as Mr. Ewart himself acknowledges, the Sabbath is mentioned outside of the Pentateuch. I will refer only to two passages given by Mr. Ewart. From these passages should the Pentateuch be lost, they would be sufficient authority to establish the law of the Sabbath in its entirety. I only mention Nehemiah 13, 15-22, and Amos 8-5. These are the words of Nehemiah. Listen:

"In those days saw I in Judah some treading wine presses on the Sabbath and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses, as also wine, grapes and figs and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the Sabbath day: and I testified against them, in the day wherein they sold victuals. There dwelt men of Tyre also therein, which brought fish, and all manner of ware, and sold on the Sabbath unto the children of Judah in Jerusalem. Then I contended with the nobles of Judah and said unto them, What evil thing is this that ye do and profane the Sabbath day? Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us, and upon this city? Yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath. And it came to pass that when the gates of Jerusalem began to be dark before the Sabbath, I commanded that the gates should be shut, and charged that they should not be opened till after the Sabbath: and some of my servants sat I at the gates, that there should no burden be brought in on the Sabbath day. So the merchants and sellers of all kind of wares lodged without Jerusalem once or twice. Then I testified against them and said unto them, Why lodge ye about the wall? If ye do so again I will lay hands on you. From that time forth came they no more on the Sabbath. And I commanded the Levites that they should cleanse themselves, and that they should come and keep the gates to sanctify the Sabbath day. Remember me, O my God, concerning this also, and spare me according to the greatness of Thy mercy."

Here then we see Nehemiah:

1. Protesting against the desecration of the Sabbath.

2. Laying the responsibility for it upon the leading citizens.

3. Pointing out the inevitable consequences.

4. Using what power he had to put an end to the evil.

5. Not satisfied with one effort but keeping at it.

6. Laying upon the Godly men of the community the charge of preserving the Sabbath inviolate.

Now this is outside of the Pentateuch which Mr. Ewart has tried to tear away from the Bible. But there is another reference in Amos that calls for attention—Amos 8, 5-6:

"Here Amos emphasizes that the Sabbath is threatened by the same worldliness and love of money which tramples on the helpless. The interests of the Sabbath are the interests of the poor, the enemies of the Sabbath are the enemies of the poor. And all this illustrates our Saviour's saying that "the Sabbath was made for man."—Geo. Adam Smith (The Book of the 12 Prophets), vol. i, p. 183. Expositor's Series.

Christ and the Sabbath.

Says Mr. Ewart: "Christ appeared to take special pleasure in disregarding the weekly Sabbath. . . . He constantly flew in the face of the Sabbatarians of His day, absolutely refused to be guided by their prohibitions and made no scruple of telling them so. . . . So far then as we have any record of Christ's actions or words, we are justified in saying that He broke quite away from the fourth commandment."

Pharisaic Sabbath.

A stranger medley of truth and error one would have to travel far to find. A moment's reflection will be sufficient to set the matter right.

As it is necessary in the Pentateuch to keep the transient ceremonial laws distinct from the perpetual moral law, so in reading the Gospels it is important to distinguish very carefully between the Pharisaic Sabbath and the Sabbath of the fourth commandment. Christ always observed the fourth commandment. Instead of abrogating it He repeatedly confirmed it. On five different occasions He endorsed the Decalogue (and so the Sabbath) as of perpetual and universal obligation, and also gave a special and direct endorsement of the Sabbath. Commandment by itself, when He said: "The Sabbath is made for man."

Mr. Ewart not having clearly distinguished the Pharisaic Sabbath of the fourth commandment and perceiving dimly that Christ antagonized some Sabbath, has jumped to the false conclusion that it was the Divine original, when it was only the Pharisaic counterfeit. Christ rebuked nothing in the Sabbath but its abuse. Christ's condemnations of Pharisaic modes of Sabbath observance no more abolish the Sabbath than His condemnation of Pharisaic alms-giving and prayer, abolish benevolence and prayer. Every Sunday school scholar understands that. Nay, far from abrogating the Sabbath law, Christ prophesied that His Disciples would observe it long years after His death should rend the temple veil and the ceremonial law. He said in His prophesy of the destruction of Jerusalem: "Pray that your flight be not in the winter, nor on the Sabbath day."—Mat. 24 :20.

And, besides, Christ's habit in connection with the Sabbath, is one of the strongest examples that every Sunday school teacher has, to inculcate the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath on his scholars—and, further, Christ's miracles teach still more clearly that He upheld the true Sabbath, while condemning the Pharisaic counterfeit. A bare comparison of Matthew 12, 1-13, with the parallel passages Mark 2, 23-38, and Luke 6, 1-11, show this without a shadow of doubt.

This incident alone, in connection with the miracles and conversations of Christ, shows that Christ as Lord of the Sabbath, maintained:—

1st.—That works of necessity had always been allowable on the Sabbath, Matthew 12: 1-8, plucking wheat to satisfy hunger, and Luke 13: 15, watering cattle.

2nd.—That works of religion had not only been allowed but enjoined, Mat. 12: 5, 6, temple work; Luke 14: 1-6, visiting for religious conversation; John 7: 23, circumcision as a religious work allowed on the Sabbath.

3rd.—That works of mercy had always been not only permissive but obligatory, Matt. 12: 9-13, withered hand healed; Mark 1: 21-34, healing of demoniac and Peter's wife's mother, Luke 13: 10-17, woman with infirmity, and John 5: 1-17, impotent man healed; John 9: 1-16, blind man healed.

It passes my comprehension how any one who has given the least thought to the matter, and is anxious to hold his reputation as a scholar, can in the presence of such facts, connect his name with a statement like

this: "Christ refused to be bound by the law, the moral law of the Decalogue as set fourth in the fourth commandment and as embodied in the Old Testament."

The Apostles and Sunday.

Says Mr. Ewart: "If Christ did not institute a new Sabbath did the apostles do so? Texts may be quoted pro and con, but with a single suggestion all becomes clear. The account of the first council at Jerusalem as given in Acts 15: 1-29 is referred to."

This passage we know is often quoted to prove that Sabbath observance was not in Apostolic days one of the "necessary things" as it is not in this passage (Acts 15: 1-29) enumerated in a list of such things.

But it is sufficient to answer that the list referred only to questions then in debate and omitted not only the fourth commandment but all the other commandments except the seventh. If it proves the Sabbath no longer binding, it proves the same of the laws against theft and murder.

Paul and the Sabbath.

Rom. 14: 5, 6—Gal. 4: 9-11—Col. 2: 16, 17.—Converted Jews raised some questions as to whether Christians ought not to keep the seventh day as well as the first,—but there is no record of any controversy in the early church in regard to keeping the first day. This fact explains the misinterpreted words of Paul about the Sabbath. They cannot mean an abrogation of the law which he pronounces "holy, just and good." Rom. 7: 12, and which his master five times re-affirmed. All becomes clear when we keep in mind that the observance of the first day of the week was never controverted in the early church but only the question whether the preceding day, the Jewish Sabbath was also a day of obligation to Christians—Paul advises toleration and patience with those who cannot yet see that all that was Jewish about "days and months and years" is superseded—Paul's words are consistent with a change of date but not with a change in the Decalogue.—Rom. 14: 5, 6—"One man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day alike."—Col 2: 17—"Sabbath days which are shadows of things to come."

"Paul is not thinking, so far as we can gather his thoughts from the context, of anything Christian, but simply protesting against the retention of anything Jewish. Nor have we any right to say that analogically, days are forbidden under Christianity. Analogy if it proved or could prove anything would rather go to show that these days of Judaism which are confessedly Skia, or rather parts of Skia, or dispensation of shadows, must have their counterparts in corresponding Christian institutions. It is however worth notice, that St. Paul, according to his own testimony, (1 Cor. 16-2) had already urged on the very Galatians, whom he desires not to be bound by Jewish days, the performance of the duty of alms-giving on a certain Christian day, the first day of the week." (Hessey.)

Gal. 4: 10, "Ye observe days and months and times and years."

"The observance of sacred times was an integral part of the old dispensation. Under the new they have ceased to have any value except as means to an end. The great principle that "the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath," though underlying the Mosaic ordinances was first distinctly pronounced by our Lord. The setting apart of special days for the service of God is a confession of our imperfect state an avowal that we cannot and do not devote our whole time to Him. Sabbaths will then be superseded when our life becomes one eternal Sabbath."—(Bishop Lightfoot.)

"As the bearing of this passage on the general question of the observance of seasons, it is to be noticed that the reference is here to the adoption by the Galatians of the Jewish seasons as a mark of the extent to which they were prepared to take on themselves the burden of the Mosaic law. It does not necessarily follow that the observance of Christian seasons is condemned."—Sanday.

The comparison between the literal and the spiritual observance of seasons and the superiority of the latter as the more excellent way is well brought out by Origen in some comments on this passage. He says:—

"If it is objected to us on this subject that we are accustomed to observe certain days—as, for example, the Lord's day, the Preparation, the Passover, or Pentecost—I have to avow that to the perfect Christian who is ever in his thoughts, words and deeds serving his natural Lord, God the Word—All his days are the Lord's, and he is always keeping the Lord's day. He also who is unceasingly preparing himself for the true life, and abstaining from the pleasures of this life which lead astray so many, such a one is always keeping the preparation day. Again he who considers that "Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us," and that it is his duty to keep

the feast by eating of the flesh of the Lord, never ceases to keep the Paschal Feast. And finally, he who can truly say "We are risen with Christ," and "He hath exalted us and made us sit with Him in heavenly places in Christ is always living in the season of Pentecost. . . . But the majority of those **who are accounted believers are not of this advanced class; but from being either unable or unwilling** to keep every day in this manner they require some sensible memorial to prevent Spiritual things from passing away altogether from their minds. (Against Celsus VIII, 22,23). In presence of all this every one can at once see the value to be set on Mr. Ewart's contention, that "the apostles although sometimes tolerating the continued observance of the Jewish rites, such as circumcision and Sabbath, clearly teach for the followers of Christ" freedom from the law" of the Sabbath, on the Lord's day.

Time of Keeping the Sabbath.

Says Mr. Ewart: "Why do Sabbatarians refuse to keep God's law as God made it. . . . If Sabbath observance rests upon creation precedent, then the time runs from evening to evening."

Now the seventh day is the Sabbath —not the seventh day of the week," but the regularly recurring seventh day after six day's labor. In Numbers 29: 31: "Friday" is called the seventh day, and the Jewish Sabbath "the eighth day," having reference as here to certain preceding days, not to its place in the week. So Christ rose the third day, as related to preceding events, but on the first day of the week." The commandment has nothing to do with a Saturday Sabbath. There is nothing in the fourth commandment about keeping Saturday as a holy day. Men are there told to work six days and rest the next. The people that begin work on Monday and rest on Sunday do that as surely as those who rest Saturday. As to beginning the Sabbath from evening to evening, instead of midnight to midnight, I presume that is merely a matter of convenience and does not affect in any way whatever the principle of six days' work and one day's rest.

Those who insist that the Divine authority for a change of day can not be established by anything else than a specific New Testament command, forget that Christ's acts are legislative "acts" quite as authoritative as His sermons. It was by His resurrection more than by any words that he was "declared to be the Son of God with power," (Rom. 1: 4), and there is sufficient in His life to warrant the change; so has it been considered by the body of the Christian people with the exception of a very small number.

The Idea of the Sabbath.

"But what is the Old Testament Sabbath ?" asks Mr. Ewart. The chief passages relating to it in the Old Testament are Genesis, ii., 3; Exodus, xx., 9-11; Exodus, xxxi., 13-17; Deut., v., 12-15. "The chief matter of which is. God created the world in six days (whether they are periods of time, 24 hours or years, makes no difference), and rested on the seventh, and therefore blessed and hallowed this day, on which His work was complete. Hence the people whom He has consecrated to Himself and who acknowledge the Creator and Lord of the World as their God, are also to hallow the seventh day as a day of rest after every six days labor in the works of their calling, and this is to be a sign of the covenant between God and His people." "So man, like God, is to work and rest; this human life is to be a copy of Divine life. Divine labor terminates in happy rest; not till the Creator rests satisfied in the contemplation of His works is His creation itself complete. So, too, human labor is not to run on in resultless circles, but to terminate in a happy harmony of existence."(—Oehler.)

The Sabbath is thus a Divine institution, or, to speak more correctly, a gift of Divine grace for the sanctification of the people. Ezekiel, xx., 12. "I gave them my Sabbath, to be a sign between Me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them."

The Church's View.

We have seen what the Sabbath is in the Old Testament in the teaching of Christ and his apostles, and now we must refer to the church view of it as Mr. Ewart has seen fit to give us his account of it.

Now, the church view, at least, the Protestant view of Sunday, as it exists, in the creed of the church and her authorized formularies, with the exception perhaps of the Lutherans, and Roman Catholics, may be summed up as follows, in the words of Philip Schaff, in his Creeds of Christendom :

Summary.

1. The Sabbath is a Divine law of nature (Jus divinum naturale), rooted in the constitution of men, and hence instituted, together with marriage, at

the creation, in the state of innocence, for the perpetual benefit of body and soul;

2. It is a positive moral law (Jus divinum positivum), given through Moses, with reference to the primitive institution ("Remember") and to the typical redemption of Israel from bondage.

3. If a commemoration of the new creation and finished redemption by the resurrection of Christ; hence the change from the last to the first day of the week, and its designation "The Lord's Day," (Dies Dominica). And it requires the day to be wholly devoted to the exercises of public and private worship, and the duties of necessity and mercy.

The Church of England View.

The Prayer Book of the Church of England, by incorporating the responsive reading of the Decalogue in the regular service, keeps alive in the minds of the people the perpetual obligation of the fourth commandment.

"We are bound to account the sanctification of one day in seven a duty which God's immutable law doth exact forever."—Hooker Eccles. Polity, Bk. X, Ch. 70, Sec. 9.

"In the fourth commandment God hath given express charge to all men that upon the Sabbath Day, which is now our Sunday, they should cease from all weekly and work day labor, to the intent that as God Himself wrought six, rested the seventh, blessed and sanctified it and consecrated it to rest and quietness from labor, even so God's obedient people should use the Sunday holily, and rest from their common and daily business, and also give themselves wholly to Heavenly exercises of God's true religion and service." (Twentieth Homily.)

Lambeth Conference, 1888.

Report of the committee appointed to consider the subject of the observance of Sunday.

Your committee have met and prayerfully considered the subject of the sanctity and observance of the Lord's Day, and have agreed to the following statement of their deliberate judgment on this momentous question, which they submit as their report:

1. That the principle of the religious observance of one day in seven is of divine and primeval obligation, and was afterwards embodied in the fourth commandment.

2. That from the time of our Lord's Resurrection the first day of the week was observed as a day of sacred joy by Christians and was ere long adopted by the church as the Christian Sabbath ordered.

3. That the observance of the Lord's Day as a day of rest, of worship, and of religious teaching, has been a priceless blessing in all Christian lands in which it has been maintained.

4. That the growing license in its observance threatens a grave change in its sacred and beneficent character.

5. That especially the increasing practice on the part of some of the wealthy and leisurely classes of making the day a day of secular amusement is most strongly to be deprecated.

6. That the most careful regard should be had to the danger of any encroachment upon the rest which on this day is the right of servants, as well as their masters, and of the working classes as well as their employers.

The Methodist View.

Pastoral address of the centennial conference of all American Methodist churches, December, 1884. "A spiritual church without a Sabbath is an impossibility. God has consecrated one-seventh of our days to rest and worship. The law enjoining its observance is both positive and moral, imbedded in the Decalogue, enforced in the New Testament, and interpreted and illustrated in the practice of the primitive church. But it is not less a benevolent than a positive institution. It is needed by all the toiling millions of earth. To the laborer it is a boon of priceless value, and to the professional man and the man of business, with nerve and brain strained to the utmost tension, it comes as a benediction indeed; to the Christian, it is indispensable. All classes need the physical and moral recuperation it brings; but this precious gift of God is imperilled by the sordid claims of mammon, and the no less imperious claims of sensuality. It behooves the church to stand up in the firmness of her God-given might to withstand the aggressions of evil men who would destroy this pillar of our Christian civilization. We ask first of all that in your own personal conduct you will honor the Divine command: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Make the holy day a delight and not a burden. Gather into it all the light and cheerfulness of a living faith. Be joyful in the Lord. Put away secular thoughts and conversations, secular reading and work, and let the day be sacred to spiritual exercises and refreshments, and to works of Charity

and necessity. We beseech you, as Christian people, to stand like a wall of adament against all who would profane the day of the Lord."

The Congregational View.

Clerical Union of Congregational ministers of New York and vicinity.

"We are constrained to make emphatic declaration of our belief that the fourth commandment of the Decalogue, as interpreted by Christ, is binding upon the conscience of man and authorative over the life of individuals, corporations and communities. Most solemnly, as in the presence of a great peril to our civil and religious liberties, to the prevalence of morality and righteousness, as well as an affront to the majesty of Divine law, do we entreat the members of our churches to reduce to the limits of necessity and mercy their Sunday work for themselves and the servants of their households.

The Baptist View.

New Hampshire Baptist Confession, 1883:

XV. of the Christian Sabbath:

"We believe that the first day of the week is the Lord's Day or Christian Sabbath; and is to be kept sacred to religious purposes by abstaining from all secular labor and sinful recreations; by the devout observance of all the means of grace, both private and public and by the preparation for that "rest that remaineth for the people of God."

(Shaff Creeds of Christendom, Vol. III, 747.) Confession of the Free Will Baptists 1834, 1868, Chapter XIV.

The Sabbath—"This is one day in seven, which from the creation of the world, God has set apart for sacred rest and holy service. Under the former dispensation, the seventh day of the week, as commemorative of the work of creation, was set apart for the Sabbath. Under the Gospel, the first day of the week, in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ, and by authority of the apostles, is observed as the Christian Sabbath. On this day all men are required to refrain from secular labor and devote themselves to the worship and service of God." (Schaff, W., p. 754.

The Presbyterian View.

Westminister Confession, Ch. xxi,vii, viii.—vii."As it is of the law of nature that in general a due proportion of time be set apart for the worship of God, so, in His Word, by a positive, moral, and perpetual, commandment binding all men in all ages, he hath particularly appointed one day in seven for a Sabbath, to be kept holy unto them, which from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ was the last day of the week, and from the resurrection of Christ was changed into the first day, which in Scripture is called the Lord's Day, and is to be continued to the end of the world as the Christian Sabbath."

VIII.—"This Sabbath is then holy unto the Lord when men, after a due preparing of their hearts, and ordering of their common affairs beforehand do not only observe an holy rest all the day, from their own works, words and thoughts about their worldly employments and recreations, but also are taken up the whole time in the public and private exercises of his worship, and in the duties of necessity and mercy."

—Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, Vol. III., p. 646.

Now such being the church view and Bible view of Sunday, the question comes how is the Sunday street car traffic compatible with these views. This leads to the consideration of this traffic in its several aspects.

The Working Man.

The interests of the working man is a religious question. Now the advocates of the Sunday street car traffic, claim that it will be in the interest of the workingman. To their satisfaction they prove that this traffic will contribute towards making the workingman healthy, wealthy and wise.

Rest.

Rest is a religious question, and how is it affected by the traffic? How are the street car employees affected by it? It has been said that should men refuse to work on the Lord's Day they would be free to leave the service. True. But Sabbath-breaking corporations bring to bear on their servants the only compulsion they can: the pressure of the "financial screw," their power to oust him from employment and deprive him and his family of bread. To say the least, they tempt him strongly and systematically to work when he ought to be resting, and as he has an interest to rest on the Lord's Day, so he has an interest in not being tempted to do otherwise.

The Whole Working Class.

Not only the street car employees but the whole working class have an interest in being allowed to enjoy the weekly rest, an interest never deeper

than now in these days of incessant and manifold labor. And this interest is solely protected by the rule or law that no ordinary secular business demanding ordinary secular work shall be done on the first day of the week.

But this is broken by the Sunday street car traffic, which necessitates a certain amount of ordinary work on the day of rest. It will be objected that this amount of work is small in comparison to the great burden of the other week day work. Yes, but "unfaith in aught is want of faith in all." If the rule or law be systematically broken in the one case of the Sunday street car traffic, it will have no other force to protect the workman's rest in any other case.

Let our street railway company be allowed to work their servants on the Lord's Day, what then, is to hinder store, farm or factory owners from doing the same when once, as in the case of street railway corporations, man's selfish greed has overcome the surviving power of principle or shame?

The traffic, which destroys the rest of one class of workmen, at the same time endangers the rest of the whole.

Our street car servants, motormen, conductors, etc., now stand in the sacred Thermopylae of the freedom of all workingmen in the city to rest on the Sabbath Day.

Wages.

But it may be asked: Granted that it were against the interest of the workmen to lose his weekly day of rest, will not this be amply compensated for by increased pecuniary interest?

The gain in money is an illusion pure and simple. What, in fact, would be the effect upon wages if Sabbath labor became the rule? This is a very simple question in political economy.

The rate of wages, the price of labor is always determined in the long run by the value of labor or the quantity or quality of work produced. Now, it is evident and it has been proved by experience, that he who labors only six days in the week must produce more work and better than if he labored all the seven. So, Sabbath labor, far from augmenting the workman's wage, will inevitably diminish it. And a living wage is a religious question.

The Sunday street car traffic then, besides being against the workman's interest as to his rightful day of rest, is against his interest as to his due gains.

Health.

Health is a religious question, and for maintaining the body in the fulness of healthful vigor, a weekly day of rest is a necessity of life. Unbroken continuity of toil, from year's end to year's end, will undermine the strength of the workman, thereby shortening his life and embittering it while it lasts.

Character.

Not only is Sunday work against the interest of the workingman as to his rest, his wages, his health, it is against his interest as to his character—and character is a religious question. The system of Sabbath labor degrades and brutalizes the workman's character. It makes him feeble, short-lived, spiritless, and an abject slave.

The Interest of the Community.

Employer as well as employee needs rest. The managers of the street railway company as well as the conductors and motermen need rest. Speaking in a general way, for many an employer even the pressure of only six days work threatens to turn him into a mere mechanical machine. What if the employees are to work on the seventh day? Surely there can be no immunity for the employer. Then if one master with his men be allowed to work how can others rest in those days of grinding competition? The rest of the master as well as the servant needs the protecting angel of the Sabbath day. On the grounds then of physical rest, of money making ,of bodily health, of character, it is clear that any Sunday traffic, however small in itself, yet a sure precursor of greater, is inimical to the interest of men of every class.

The Spiritual Interest.

There is considerable religion in the temporal interests of man. But man has not only temporal interest, he has spiritual interests also. The body and bodily faculties of man are not all that go to make up a man, an essential factor in the nature of man is his immortal soul. A life that consists in the knowledge of God, in communion with God, in love for God, in holy aspiration after God—a rest which cultivates merely the mind and body and leaves the soul a waste is not the rest which God made for man. To cultivate the body without the mind is to train man a powerful beast; to cultivate the mind without the soul, is simply to give him the education of a devil. When therefore our Sabbath desecrators talk of secular Sunday as an education of man, they lead us to

respect that like their predecessors, the Sadducees of old they believe in no angel, nor spirit, nor resurrection."

The Bible law of the Sabbath proceeds upon the Bible doctrine of man that he has a soul, an immortal spirit, that properly speaking it is the soul that constitutes the man. The Sabbath was made for man, for man principally because it is good for the soul. And if it is good for the soul it follows that it must be good for the mind and the body. And yet there are advocates of Sunday street cars, who are neither secularists, materialists, or atheists, who are content to reason this question out merely on the ground of temporal interest.

Spiritual Needs.

The spiritual life like all other life has its conditions and requirements. Time for withdrawal from secular concerns is essential for its development. The soul of the God-fearing man, no less than his body and mind needs periodical repose. The souls of the masses of lost men need to be converted to God. For these needs the Sabbath is indispensable for both the origination and sustentation of spiritual life in its fullness in the soul. And man on earth needs for his spiritual life paternal props and guards and helps which the Sabbath alone is calculated to secure for him. True, one man in a million may be so constituted as to be able to do without these props. But if there is such a man, a "rara avis in terris, nigroque simillima cygno," I have never known him. But the question is not what is good for one man in a million, but what is good for the million, the commonplace mass of ordinary people like you and me and all our neighbors, friends and acquaintances. Now to this question experience answers where there is no Christian Sabbath there is little or no Christian life.

Now [illegible] full enjoyment of this holy rest there must be in the world around us an outward quiet, a Sabbath stillness [illegible] and enabling the [illegible] to be still and know that the [illegible] God. Yet this is necessarily [illegible] by the Sunday street car [illegible]. This traffic even in its least offensive form dispels the hush of the Sabbath stillness. As an illustration, take the swish of the street car on a week day, as it passes under the windows of churches, where some earnest, [illegible] in [illegible] of deliverance. Why, Grace church, in this city, is already speaking of changing its location on the ground that Sunday street cars may impair its efficiency.

A Great Danger.

But not only does the Sunday street car traffic destroy the external quiet needed for the Sabbath, it has a tendency to ruin that for which the Sabbath was instituted, viz., the soul of man. Everyone knows and feels in his own heart that the natural and irresistible result of this Sunday traffic must be to withdraw all who take part in it from the care of their own souls, to divert them from the cultivation of those interests that are spiritual and eternal. It certainly and seriously endangers the souls of Sabbath working street car servants and Sabbath pleasure seekers. And it tempts the whole community to take part in a traffic or pleasure which endangers the soul. The whole community, you say, is that not far fetched? No, if this traffic, while ruining the temporal rest of its servants, endangers the temporal welfare of the whole community, with reference to the spiritual rest of all and here the maxim applies

Obsta Principiis.

But the question of Sunday street car traffic cannot be separated from the question of

Amusements.

Sunday street cars could be legitimate only on the ground that they are a necessity. Who will dare to take this position? Of course, it cannot be denied that for some they would be a great boon. Those who live at a great distance from their churches would find them a convenience. But here the matter of right and the good of the whole have to be considered. This is not a question of personal or congregational advantage, but one to be decided by the will of God.

But, then, let not the church goers who may vote for the by-law be here deceived.

By-law Merely Permissive.

If the by-law carries it does not follow that there will be a Sunday street car service on every line to bring the people to church. The company may or not put cars on after the vote. The by-law is merely permissive, and that is no doubt intended to give the company all the pecuniary advantage it may wish. Cars will be put on for the crowds on the paying lines, to take the people to some resort for recreation and amusement. The effort of

the company to extend its operation outside of the city tends that way. The projected Silver Heights, Selkirk and Bird's Hill line all point that way.

What the company is after is dividends. Greed actuates it in its operations. The company has no desire to bring people to church only so far as it brings money into their coffers. Let not church goers then be deceived. The traffic is not intended to help them. But they may help the company to break down the Sabbath, by helping it to provide amusements and recreation for the masses and thus draw them away from church.

Heaven and Hell Amalgamation.

In the words of Canon Wade, then of the Church of the Ascension in Hamilton, I would tell church goers to have nothing to do with this heaven and hell amalgamation by voting for the by-law and patronizing the cars on Sunday. Let them follow the example of the labor party, the U. B. of R. E. and the brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners and walk. It is not the workingman that asks for amusements and recreation, but the idler. The majority of workingmen are glad enough to get the Sunday for physical rest, and a large proportion of them seek that rest in spiritual worship. Idlers and loafers who spend six days in amusing themselves are the real claimants for the seventh and to quote an apt remark on this point, "The amusement market is completely glutted, it is one of the greatest industries of the country. The daily and other newspapers contain column after column devoted to advertising and reporting the recreations of the people on six days in the week. Yet it is said that six days are not enough the seventh must also be swallowed up with amusements.

These are the class of people that use the name of the workingmen to get recreation on Sunday. In England leading journals are signaling the danger of amusements among the upper classes on the Lord's day. Dinner parties, tennis parties, boating, driving, are more indulged in on Sunday than on any other day. And this Anglomania has reached us here in Winnipeg. But listen to what the St. James Gazette, by no means a Puritan organ said in April, 1899—"Purely selfish amusements which exact the labor of others, are more inexcusable on Sunday than on any other day of the week. The silly and empty headed ostentation in the so-called upper circles cannot be denounced too strongly. . . . The utter absence of right feeling and good taste among people who might be looked to for refinement is nowhere more apparent than in the Sunday diversions of the rich and the smart." But some will say, perhaps, it is ridiculous to connect all this with the Sunday street car traffic. The small amount of recreation that will be furnished by it cannot be compared with the greater scale of amusement referred to. True, but the principle is the same. Open the flood gates and the tide will run in. Again I say,

Obsta Principiis.

And amusement cannot be had without work. Allow the amusement industry to flourish and then all other industries must on the ground of fair play and justice follow. Sunday street car traffic, amusement, Sunday labor, is a trinity of evil, like intemperance, infidelity and impurity.

The Testimony of Experience.

The Sunday street car traffic has been tried and found wanting. As will be seen by the following testimonies. So as to speak from experience and not mere theory, I wrote to leading men in Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton and London, asking their opinion about the effect of Sunday street cars generally, and you have below the answer of a number of them. The letters speak for themselves and require no comment on my part.

Dundas Centre Methodist Church
London, Ont., Nov. 15, 190[illegible]

Rev. J. J. Roy, B.A., Winnipeg.

Dear Brother: We have no Sunday cars in London; we do not need any. I mistake the spirit of our workingmen if they would not repudiate the specious plea that Sunday cars are "the poor man's carriage." They know well that when soulless corporations get to squeeze the public for their own profit it is usually done under the guise of philanthrophy.

No class can be forced to work seven days in the week, the inevitable outcome of Sunday cars, without imperilling the rights of every other working man. Sunday is the soul's brooding day. It should be the day for strengthening the family ties. Turning it into a mere pleasure day must, in the long run, work disastrously for the nation. My motto is, "Five days for work, one for recreation, and one for God."

Respectfully yours,
C. S. SCOTT

First Methodist Church
London, Ont., Nov. 15, 1902

Rev. J. J. Roy.

My Dear Sir and Brother, I am sorry that an unusual pressure of extra work has prevented an earlier reply to your letter received a few days ago, asking

for some observations on Sunday street cars.

You do well. I am convinced, in emphasizing the religious aspects of the question.

1. It is the Sabbath of the Lord and of universal and perpetual obligation as such, an established sign of God's relation to man and of man's relation to God. Every proper observance of the day is an acknowledgment of God and of man's obligation to love and obey him. Every violation of the law of the Sabbath is an act of disobedience and of rebellion against His authority.

2. The Sabbath for man depends upon its being observed as a Sabbath unto God. The Sabbath cannot hold its own against covetousness and pleasure seeking, even with the help of civic law, unless men are persuaded that it is a day holy unto the Lord.

3. It can only be a day of rest in the true sense as it is observed as a day of worship. If it is to be a day of rest it cannot be a day of recreation or of pleasure seeking.

4. It was made for man, every man, the street car conductor and motorman as well as the passenger, director and stockholder.

I am persuaded that the first and final appeal is to man's conscience in the sight of God, assured that we will be held to a strict account of our observance of His law.

May the Lord prosper you in your efforts to maintain the sanctity of the day. Yours sincerely,

GEO. J. BISHOP.

St. John's Rectory,
London, Ont., 11th Nov., 1902.

Dear Brother: When the electric street cars were accepted in London some years ago, there was, by vote of the city council, incorporated in the charter a clause against their use on Sunday. This condition has been rigidly observed, without any expressed desire of the city or company to have it cancelled.

There are these three reasons which I think weigh with the majority of our citizens against Sunday street cars:

1. They would seriously disturb the peace and quiet of our Day of Rest.

2. They would tend to secularize and desecrate the day commanded to be kept holy.

3. They would entail work and labor, and thus destroy the true character of the Lord's Day.

These are very simple and often quoted sentiments, but they are capable of considerable enlargement and satisfactory. Yours faithfully,

J. B. RICHARDSON.

St. Stephen's Church, Wendale Park,
Montreal, Nov. 12, 1902.

My dear Mr. Roy:—While it cannot be denied that a Sunday street car service, in a large city, is a great convenience to church goers whose conscience will allow them to use them, and to those whose vocations compel them to go to work on Sunday, often at a long distance from home.

It is to be remembered that the question is not one of convenience, but of principle. For the Christian man Sabbath labor is confined to "piety, charity and necessity." It would be difficult to bring in the running of Sunday street cars under any of these heads, excepting in a very strained sense.

There are reasons which go to justify the running of railway trains on Sunday which do not apply to street railways.

Serious objections to the running of street railways lies in the fact that the employees are practically unchurched. The quiet of the Lord's Day destroyed, worship interrupted, where the cars run near churches, and the public encouraged and assisted to move about in search of amusement instead of spending the day as intended. I fear there is nothing new or fresh in these ideas, but, so the matter presents itself to me. With kind regards. Very sincerely yours,

LEWIS EVANS.

St. Martin's Rectory,
Montreal, 12th Nov., 1902.

Dear Mr. Roy: I fear I can say nothing to add to your own contribution to the great subject under discussion. The Sabbath was made for man, is the foundation principle. "Made for man" and therefore in his own interests to be most jealously guarded. Such experience as we have in Montreal makes me doubly sure that nothing short of absolute necessity can justify the running of street cars on Sunday.

That they are really necessary on Sunday in such a city as Winnipeg, surely few will be bold enough to maintain. An unnecessary invasion of the Lord's day will inevitably bring a curse and not a blessing. Yours in sincerity,

J. OSBORNE TROOP.

The Rev. J. J. Roy.

Montreal, Nov. 12, 1902.

Rev. J. J. Roy, Winnipeg.

Dear Sir: Re Sunday street cars. Whatever necessity there may be for Sunday street cars in a densely populated city of great distances, there is no justification for their introduction in Winnipeg at the present time.

To run them under present conditions, is, my judgment, to transgress the command "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy."

This command is not arbitrary. The necessity for it is in the nature of man, and no one can disregard it without serious consequences; first to his physical nature and second to his moral and spiritual life.

It is said that only one man on one of the New York dailies has reached fifty years of age, and that all journalists in that city die young because they know no Sunday.

We are told that in England that when factory operators worked twelve hours a day the average age among them was

twenty-two years, now, nine hours a day and Saturday afternoon off. It is thirty-seven years.

The moral consequences, as all history proves, are more serious still when the Sabbath law is disregarded. Rest on any other day of the week can never be a substitute for the Sabbath rest. It does not afford suitable opportunity for religious instruction and worship.

The moral atmosphere of the Lord's day is one of the most potential features which no other day can supply.

C. E. MANNING
164 Windsor street, Montreal.

Wesleyan Theological College, Principal Emeritus, 315 Prince Arthur Street.
Montreal, Nov. 12, 1907.

From my long observation in Montreal I believe that Sunday street cars are one of the greatest foes of religion, one of the most effective means of diverting the masses of the people from Christian worship, and one of the most efficient in promoting Sabbath desecration.

WILLIAM SHAW

Vancouver, Nov. 9, 1907.

My Dear Friend: What I now say applies only to Vancouver and to the holiday season there.

From that point of view, I consider Sunday street cars as the most powerful agents of worldliness in the community, all the more that they disarm opposition, seeming to be harmless and to minister to the wants of the public. When they carry scores to the church they carry thousands to the pleasure grounds. Largely through their means, a fair day is almost as ruinous to church attendance as a rainy one. The street car company reaps its richest harvest on the Lord's Day, while motormen and conductors are robbed of their day of rest. The company engages a band to play in the park and cars pass along our principal streets crowded to suffocation, while children are going to Sunday school and families to evening service. Under the guise of pleasure they beguile thousands into working on Sunday as hard as on other days, and send them back anything but refreshed to the duties of the Monday. For all these reasons, I consider Sunday street cars as one of the most secularizing influences in the whole community.

With kinds regards, I'm yours sincerely,

L. NORMAN TUCKER

Bloor Street Presbyterian Church,
Corner Bloor and Huron Streets,
15 Madison Avenue,
Toronto, Nov. 11, 1907.

The Rev. J. J. Roy, Winnipeg.

Dear Sir,—In answer to your inquiry, I desire to say that I believe that Sunday street cars in Toronto, while no doubt contributing to the convenience of very many, have intensified the general restlessness and feverishness which are so inimical to quiet thought and growth of character, and have sadly impaired in men's minds the sense of the sanctity of the Lord's Day by making it to many a day of amusement and pleasure-seeking.

Wishing you success in your objection to the introduction of Sunday cars in Winnipeg, I am, very truly,

W. J. WALLACE

[illegible] South St.
Hamilton, Nov. 10, 1907.

My Dear Roy: Your letter to hand. Have noticed through the press that Sunday street cars are being advocated in Winnipeg. Wish you every success in your vigorous fight against them. But I fear that the combined strength of the pleasure seekers and the lust for gain together with the apathy of many even professed Christians, will defeat you unless you are protected by law.

However, it is ours to contend for the right whatever our odds.

We have the Sunday cars. They are no necessity, they may be a convenience, but so would the open store, butcher shop, etc., be to some. They disturb public worship very much along the street where they run, especially in the morning time when the doors and windows are open. Protestants have had to be entered. Their whole tendency is to a sad regard for the sanctity of the Lord's Day. In summer from 10,000 will crowd the cars for every hour's off to parks rather than go to the house of God. Hundreds of men are deprived of their rights, their rest and privilege to meet with God's people in God's house, all to gratify the lust for pleasure and the greed of gold. It is a painful fact that soon much lower ideas regarding the the Lord's Day will be held by many, soon those who now believe them a sin will be found to patronize them. The leaven does its work slowly but surely. I am, your truly,

A. MacWILLIAMS

The Church of the Ascension,
Hamilton, Ont., Nov. 10, 1907.

Rev. J. J. Roy, B.A.,
Winnipeg, Man.

Reverend and dear Sir: In reply to your enquiry I would say that several years ago the members of the churches in this city succeeded in getting the street cars to run on the Lord's Day. The arrangement has been successful, giving every facility to the people to spend their Sundays at our delightful resorts on the lake and making it very pleasant for the Sunday yachtsmen and Sunday golfers.

With our supply of Sunday newspapers from Detroit and Buffalo we are quite up-to-date. Indeed "the Heaven and Hell amalgamation" is in full blast in this ambitious city. Yours sincerely,

W. H. WADE

I subjoin a Roman Catholic testimony in the form of a quotation, from

the late Cardinal Gibbons, it bears on the point:

"If these encroachments are not checked in time the day may come when the religious quiet, now happily reigning in our well ordered cities, will be changed into noise and turbulence, when the sound of the church bell will be drowned by the echo of the hammer and the dray, when the Bible and the prayer-book will be supplanted by the newspaper and the magazine, when the votaries of the theatres and the drinking saloon will outnumber the religious worshippers and salutary thoughts of God, of eternity, and of the soul, will be checked by the cares of business and by the pleasures and dissipations of the world.

The following quotation may also be applied to the subject under consideration:

The Rev. A. J. Gordon, Baptist, is dead, but still speaketh:

"In an anti-Sabbath convention I heard several well-known free-thinkers appealing vehemently to the people to rise against the tyranny of Sunday laws and restrictions. 'Let the day be as free as any other,' they demanded. Let the cars and steamboats run ad libitum for conveying the tired people on excursions into the fields and upon the waters. Let the reading rooms and the theatres be open for the entertainment of the weary working people. Let the shopkeeper be free to take down his shutters and sell his fruit and refreshment to the hungry and thirsty crowds that shall pass by.

"Is it not strange that men who assume the name of advanced thinkers should put forth a plea for liberty, which is so thoughtlessly self-contradictory as this? They assume to be friends of the working men and then clamor for a freedom that shall compel them to work seven days in the week."

I tried to get the views of outsiders as to the effects of Sunday cars in a general way, and the letters given above are the result. But I also sought to get the opinion of local men as to the probable effect of Sunday cars on our Sunday schools. I reproduce three typical answers:

Church Lodge, St. John's,
Winnipeg, Nov. 18, 1902.

Dear Mr. Roy—Your inquiry as to the probable effect of Sunday street cars upon the attendance of the scholars of the Cathedral Sunday school has been handed to me.

As I have so recently taken over charge of the school, I did not care to reply without consulting my teachers, who are better versed in local conditions. Their opinion seems to be that Sunday cars would make little difference directly, but that indirectly their influence would be detrimental to the work of the school. It was also thought that in some cases they might tempt the scholars to spend Sunday afternoon away from school. Yours faithfully,

E. F. M. FLAIR.

St. Peter's Church Sunday School,
Nov. 17, 1902.

Dear Mr. Roy—In reply to your request for an expression of my opinion on the probable effect of Sunday street cars on the attendance at this Sunday school, I beg to say that I do not anticipate any great difficulty.

1. There will be no attraction on any but fine Sundays in summer for young people.

2. Those who are in earnest about attending will come in spite of the supposed attraction the cars may offer. Those not in earnest have always been able to find a plausible excuse for absence.

3. The attendance of junior scholars may occasionally be effected through their being out with friends, but I do not anticipate this will seriously affect the average. Yours faithfully,

WM. A. BURMAN.

St. Stephen's Church,
Winnipeg, Nov. 25, 1902.

My Dear Mr. Roy,—Your letter in regard to the effect of the Sunday cars upon Sabbath school attendance came when I was away from the city. I have no doubt that while at first the street cars might not immediately affect the attendance at my school to any very great extent, still eventually I feel quite sure that young boys and older boys, who are not under very strict parental control, and the atmosphere of whose homes may not be strongly Christian, would certainly be tempted to take advantage of the cars and spend the afternoon elsewhere than in Sunday school or at home. Children who come from homes characterized by wise Christian discipline will not be affected immediately by Sunday cars as far as their attendance at school is concerned, but even these will be conscious of a new atmosphere on the Lord's Day if the cars are running. The tremendous impression of the silent, restful Sabbath will be gone, and the suggestion of business and work by the running of the cars will very materially help to remove the feeling of the sacredness of the day. It is this new atmosphere of ordinary work and business that the Sunday cars will bring with them that I fear more than anything else.

With very kind regards, yours very sincerely,

CHAS. W. GORDON.

Four Typical Resolutions.

The Presbyterian Synod in session at Portage la Prairie, on motion of Dr. Bryce, seconded by Rev. C. W. Gordon, adopted this resolution opposing Sunday street cars.

The Synod, having from year to year raised its voice in behalf of the claims of working men to the freedom of their Sabbath, and having again and again with some success approached the railway companies as to diminishing the Sabbath labor of their employees, reiterate his former testimony on this matter, and bespeaks for the men of the street railway in Winnipeg the preservation of their Sabbath rights. It further affectionately counsels its people in Winnipeg, who form the most numerous religious body of the city, to resist any encroachment on the claims of the Sabbath, and to conscientiously consider the duty of using all legitimate means of opposing the movement for the introduction of Sunday street cars into the city of Winnipeg.

U. B. of R. E. Resolution.

Resolved, that as the city council of Winnipeg has failed in our estimation to safeguard the interests of the street railway employees re working seven days per week, in the event of the Sunday street car by-law carrying, therefore be it resolved that the members of the United Brotherhood of Railway Employees do all in their power to defeat the by-law.

Labor Party Resolution.

At the regular meeting of the Winnipeg Labor party held last night, after speeches by Messrs. Scott, Dales and others, the following resolution was passed:

"Whereas the city council has accepted from the legislature an act which precludes the insertion of a clause in the Sunday car by-law protecting the employees from excessive hours of work; be it resolved, that in the opinion of this party, notwithstanding the majority of its members may be in favor of Sunday cars under proper regulations, the workingmen of Winnipeg should do all in their power to defeat the present by-law, and should be prepared to walk on Sunday for another three years, if necessary, and on week days as well, rather than submit to legislation in which labor is left without consideration."

United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners' Resolution.

At the last regular meeting of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners in Trades' hall, it was unanimously resolved to oppose the present Sunday street car by-law, the company having refused what they consider adequate protection to the employees. The letter of the street railway company is also considered a loose promise and valueless as an agreement. The carpenters pledged themselves to walk "as in the past" rather than see labor exploited, which they feel would be certain under the terms offered by the street railway company.

Sabbath Penalties.

Mr. Ewart experiences great difficulties to understand the scriptural penalties connected with the Sabbath desecration. He says: "When we come to the penalties for Sunday desecration, Sabbatarians palpably hesitate and are confused. And he quotes Ex. 31: 14-15; 35: 2, and Numbers 35: 32-36."

One might ask why was Sabbath breaking considered so great a wickedness then? Because the Sabbath was a text and a sign of God's kingship. Sabbath breaking, therefore, flaunted defiance in the face of Jehovah. It was an act of deicide and treasonable in the highest degree. Listen:

"The Lord's Day is the church day, strengthening and consecrating the bond of brotherhood among all men, by their kneeling together around the altars of the One Father in heaven, but men are drawn away from this blessed communion of saints, and as a natural consequence they are lured into the counterfeit communion of Sos-systems. The Lord's Day is God's Day, rendering ever nearer and more intimate the creature and his creator and thus enobling human life in all its relations, and where this bond is weakened an effort is made to cut man loose from God entirely and to leave him, according to the expression of St. Paul 'without God in the world.'—(Pastoral letter of Baltimore Third R. C. plenary council.)

"In California pleasure runs riot on Sunday and there also is the American hotbed of communism. No other state has had a Kearney or a Hallock and the very atmosphere is foul with lying, blasphemy and perjury. The foundations of the family are loosened; conjugal infidelity is winked at as a common and venial offence; gambling is so fashionable that fortunes are won or lost by practices that make a [illegible]ckleg imply little or no disgrace.

The shamelessness of vice at noon-day on the Sabbath, and on public thoroughfares could have seemed becoming only in Sodom and Pompeii and calls down similar judgment from Heaven." These are the words of A. T. Pierson, a wide-world known American and let any one now laugh at the penalties connected with Sabbath desecration mentioned in the Bible.

In California the decay of Sabbath of observance began in pleasure seeking, in a disposition to turn at least part of the day to the ends of worldly amusement. Then, in justification of this a sufficient ground was sought either in the abrogation of the Sabbath altogether as a divine institution, or on the plea of the necessity of a day of diversion for the sake especially of working classes. Then open infidelity and atheism began the assault on the Sabbath as a relic of superstition, insisting that all religious restraint is tyrannical and intolerant and in the name of liberty demanding that there be no distinction between the days of the week, that every man has the right to do as he wills, whether in business or pleasure on Sunday," just as Mr. Ewart has been doing here. And the penalty has come and we have been asked where are the penalties now for Sabbath-breaking. Here it is in this down-grade history of the Sabbath:

First—A Holy-Day.
Second—A Holi-Day.
Third—A Work-Day.
Fourth—A Devil's Day.
And last—The Despot's Day.

God has more ways of punishing men than by having them stoned!

Sabbath Promises.

Mr. Ewart is greatly puzzled about the promises connected with Sabbath observance. And the words of Isaiah 58: 13-14, are a stumbling block to him. That should not be a stumbling block after all that has been said in my two previous lectures, about the blessings temporal and spiritual of the Sabbath. "To ride on the high places of the earth," denotes in Oriental language, exaltation above all other nations. In fact, Solomon long ago, and many since, have seen that righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."—(Prov. 14: 34.) He has apparently forgotten what has been said already on that point. But as he has great faith in the higher critics, and especially George Adam Smith, I will leave him with that "Higher Critic" just as I began with him. Says Geo. Adam Smith in his commentary in the Expositor series on Isaiah 58: 13-14:

"And yet such a prophecy concludes with an exhortation to the observance of one religious form, and places the keeping of the Sabbath on a level with the practice of love:

"If thou turn from the Sabbath thy foot, from doing thine own business on my holy day, and callest the Sabbath pleasure, the word is a strong one, delight, delicacy, luxury. Holy of Jehovah, honorable, and dost honour it so as not to do thine own ways, or find thine own business, or keep making talk, then thou shalt find thy pleasure, or thy delight in Jehovah, note the parallel of pleasure in the Sabbath and pleasure in Jehovah, and He shall cause thee to ride on the high places of the land and make thee to feed upon the inheritance of Jacob thy father. Yea, the mouth of Jehovah hath spoken. Our prophet, then, while exalting the practical service of man at the expense of certain religious forms, equally exalts the observance of the Sabbath; his scorn for their formalism changes when he comes to it into a strenuous enthusiasm of defence. This remarkable fact, which is strictly analogous to the appearance of the fourth commandment in a code otherwise consisting of purely moral and religious laws, is easily explained. Observe that our phophet bases his plea for Sabbath keeping, and his assurance that it must lead to prosperity, not on its physical, moral or social benefits, but simply upon its acknowledgment of God. Not only is the Sabbath to be honored because it is the holy of Jehovah and honorable, but **making it one's pleasure**, is equivalent to **finding one's pleasure in Him.** The parallel between these two phases in verse 13 and verse 14 is evident, and means really this: **Inasmuch as ye do it unto the Sabbath, ye do it unto me.** The prophet then, enforces the Sabbath simply on account of its religious and Godward aspect. Now, let us remember the truth, which he so often enforces, that the service of man, however ardently and widely pursued, can never lead or sum up our duty; that the service of God has logically and practically a prior claim, for without it the service of man must suffer both in obligation and in resource. God must be our first resort—must have out first homage, affection and obedience. But this cannot take place without some amount of definite and regular and frequent devotion to Him. In the most spiritual religion there is an irredu-

able minimum of formal observance. Now, in the wholesale destruction of religious forms which took place at the overthrow of Jerusalem, there was only one institution, which was not necessarily involved. The Sabbath did not fall with the temple and the altar. The Sabbath was independent of all locality. The Sabbath was possible even in exile. It was the one solemn, public, and frequently regular form in which the nation could turn to God, glorify Him and enjoy Him.

An institution which is so primitive, which is so independent of locality, which forms so natural a part of the course of time, but which above all, has twice—in the Jewish Exile and in the passage of Judaism to Christianity—survived the abrogation and disappearance of all other forms of the religion with which it was connected, and has twice been affirmed by prophecy or practice to be an essential part of spiritual religion and the equal of social morality—has amply proved its **Divine origin** and **its indispensableness to man.**

Thus orthodoxy and the "Higher Criticism" are perfectly agreed in proclaiming the **Divine Origin** of the Sabbath, and its **indispensableness** to man.

Far then from their having no valid religious objection to the Sunday street car traffic, it is felt by those advocating it, that they cannot do it without literally tearing the Bible to pieces, as Mr. Ewart has strenuously, but vainly, endeavored to do.